

Deadline 7 – Closing Statements from IPs and Aps

It is a great disappointment that since submitting my Relevant Representation (RR-0566) the Applicant appears to have taken an entrenched position on most of the issues which I and many other IPs including local authorities have raised. The Applicant has created mountains of paperwork and it appears sought to mask its deficiencies. Almost across the board it has simply just repeated what it started with.

Despite the ExA's best efforts the Applicant has been unable or unwilling to engage with the process in a responsible way. The ExA's task has thus no doubt been made more difficult. Indeed I wonder if the examination process has yet produced enough reliable information and evidence from the Applicant on the myriad of issues to enable a clear outcome.

In my Relevant Representation I raised the following issues: insufficient photographs and photomontages; inordinate size of the scheme; not temporary; creating its own huge carbon footprint; landscape and visual amenity; protection of our conservation village; green belt; BMV land; trees, glint, glare and noise. Many of these have still not been addressed satisfactorily by the Applicant.

The Applicant places great reliance on its assertion that it is sufficient for it to insist that its professional consultants' opinions are right because they are exercising their professional judgements. When challenged by the ExA and by IPs the Applicant merely trots out the same mantra again.

It is particularly disappointing that it took until Deadline 6 for the Applicant to rush through a last minute RVAA. Inevitably it was incomplete and raised many further questions. It also failed to follow the basic procedure of providing evidence and opinions based on visual appreciation from the relevant properties rather than visa-versa.

The ExA's Rule 17 letter on 23rd October seeks considerably more information and evidence from the Applicant by Deadline 7 on 10th November, and the Examination is due to close 3 days later. The timetable does not provide an opportunity for IPs to respond. This seems to me to be a very unsatisfactory situation caused by the Applicant. I trust that the ExA has the necessary powers to deal with this so that IPs are not adversely affected.

KB 10.11.25

Ref. [REDACTED]